

REMARKS

Claim 1 stands rejected under § 102 on the basis of Powell '386. Applicants traverse this rejection because Powell does not disclose (or suggest) a capacitive electrode (the opposite electrode in amended claim 1) that is divided into two or more sections in more than one pixel area, as in claim 1.

Referring to Figs. 6A and 6B of the present application, a capacitor is formed between capacitor electrode 2 and middle electrode 9a (Fig. 6A). However, as seen in Fig. 6B, the middle electrode includes two portions 9a and 9b, separated by an opening. The pixel electrode 12 spans both middle electrodes 9a, 9b, and makes contact with each middle electrode portion through contact holes 11a, 11b.

The examiner relies on the contact hole R6 in Powell '386 to establish that this feature is in the '386 reference, but R6 (A3 – A5 in Fig. 6E) has a capacitor plate 51' which does not have two portions, and appears to extend from one pixel electrode 32 to a capacitor plate 15". Thus, the reference does not disclose (or suggest) the capacitive electrode divided into two or more sections in more than one pixel recited in the present claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Powell '386 and Kitakado '902. Applicants traverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-5 for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1. Applicants traverse the rejection of independent claim 6 because there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the references, and even the

combination of the references as suggested by the examiner would not produce the present invention.

The present invention addresses problems such as point defect identification and correction, and solves the problem in an efficient manner. In claim 6, for example, a connection is located in the same layer as a source electrode and an opposite electrode of a capacitor. The connection extends between the source electrode and the opposite electrode. In addition, the opposite electrode is electrically connected to a pixel electrode through a contact hole. These are some of the aspects of the present invention that facilitate the identification of point defects.

Neither cited reference addresses or solves this problem, as highlighted by the examiner's argument. Powell merely simplifies the method of manufacturing an active matrix device (Col. 2, lines 34-37), and Kitakado provides a buffer TFT to prevent breakdown when a high voltage is applied, so the drive current can be increased. Neither of these devices, alone or in combination, facilitates point defect identification and correction.

There is also no indication that the combined references would produce the invention of claim 6. After all, the combination would merely be an active matrix device with a buffer TFT. It might handle high voltage better, but point defect identification and correction would not be improved. In fact, it would not have been obvious that the combination suggested by the examiner would work, that is, that the buffer TFT of Kitakado would work in the active matrix of Powell. For all these reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Burns', written over a horizontal line.

Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

February 21, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978